## REMARKS

Claims 1-32 are pending, with claims 20-32 having been withdrawn, and claims 1-19 remaining under consideration. Claims 1-19 have been rejected. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended hereby. Claims 1-19 remain pending and under consideration. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 are respectfully requested.

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the Examiner's withdrawal of the rejections based on Klungness et al. or Doelle and Green et al. in view of Applicants' arguments submitted in the Brief on Appeal. Now, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent (Green et al), with U.S. Patent 4,055,903 (Hansen et al.) or U.S. Patent 5,810,973 (Carlsmith et al.) to show inherency. A specific rejection of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Green et al. with Hansen et al. or Carlsmith et al. has also been stated in the Office Action. In response to these rejections, claim 1 has been amended. Accordingly, Applicants submit that claim 1 together with claims 2-19 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

Green et al. teaches treatment in a refiner or other apparatus prior to lumen loading (column 4, lines 3-5). During the actual lumen loading process steps, and specifically in the impregnation step described from column 4, line 67 to column 5, line 37 of Green et al., only simple agitation is described. Thus, the refiner of Green et al. is used only prior to the addition of the filler. After the pulp is combined with filler, only simple agitation is used for loading the filler into the fiber.

Hanson et al and Carlsmith et al. have been cited, the Examiner states, to "show that disintegrators ... or refiners ... fluff pulp." The Examiner further states, "If the fluffing pulp is

not inherently taught by Green et al. then it would have been obvious that the refiner and/or disintegrator of Green et al. would be fluffing the pulp as taught by Hansen (4,055,903) or Carlsmith (5,810,973)."

In contrast to the teachings of Green et al., Hansen et al or Carlsmith et al, claim 1 as amended recites in part:

> **adding at least one additive to the fiber suspension, at least one said additive being $CaCO_3$;**
>
> **treating the fiber suspension and the at least one additive together in a fluffer;** (Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that the invention now recited in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed nor suggested by Green et al., Hansen et al or Carlsmith et al. alone or in combination, and that the invention includes advantages over the prior art.

Whether or not Green et al. teaches fluffing in a refiner, or whether or not fluffing would be inherent or obvious from Hansen et al and/or Carlsmith et al., the treatment in the refiner of Green et al. is performed prior to the addition of the filler material. After the filler and pulp have been combined, Green at al. teaches only the use of agitation to perform the impregnation of filler into fibers. Nothing in the teaching of Green et al., Hansen et al. or Carlsmith et al. alone or in combination suggests treatment of a fiber suspension and at least one additive including at least $CaCO_3$ together in a fluffer, as recited in claim 1. Clearly, a process that teaches treatment in a refiner prior to the addition of a filler material, with only stirring or agitation thereafter, is different from and does not suggest a process in which the fiber suspension and additive are treated together in a fluffer. Treatment of the fiber suspension and additive together in a fluffer, in accordance with the present invention, separates the fiber material of the fiber suspension in a manner to increase the specific surface of the fiber material and to increase accessibility to educts

to the fiber material surface for optimization of the loading process. The surfaces of the fibers in the suspension are enlarged, resulting in a marked homogenization improvement and optimization of the loading process. For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended should be allowed, together with claims 2-19 depending therefrom. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 are respectfully requested

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that no combination of the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests the subject matter of the amended claims. The pending claims are therefore in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefor and authorize that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (260) 897-3400.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd T. Taylor
Registration No. 36,945

Attorney for Applicant

TTT5/dc

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
142 S. Main Street
P.O. Box 560
Avilla, IN 46710
Telephone: 260-897-3400
Facsimile: 260-897-9300

Enc.: Return postcard

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: September 17, 2003 .

Todd T. Taylor, Reg. No. 36,945
Name of Registered Representative

Signature

September 17, 2003
Date